EXHIBIT A

1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS HOUSTON DIVISION		
2			
3		IO. H-19-148-1 ION, TEXAS	
4		.011, 121212	
5		BER 10, 2021 A.M. to 12:14 P.M.	
6	5		
7	TRANSCRIPT OF SENTENCING BEFORE THE HONORABLE GRAY H. MILLER UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
8			
9			
10	APPEARANCES: (All participants wearing a mask)		
11	FOR THE GOVERNMENT: DREW	BRADYLYONS	
12 13	Depar	l Section tment of Justice New York Avenue	
14	Washi	ngton, D.C. 20005	
15			
16	FOR THE DEFENDANT: STEPH	NEN JAMES BINHAK Office of Stephen James	
17	Bin	nhak PLLC Brickell Avenue	
18	Ste 2 Miami	2010 ., Florida 33131	
19		W H. KAUFMAN	
20	277 ⁻ E	nen E. Kaufman PC Park Avenue	
21		Floor York, New York 10172	
22		RTO MARTINEZ	
23	255 A	on Hicks Eidson Alhambra Circle Nouse Suite	
24		Gables, Florida 33134	
25	Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography, transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.		

1	APPEARANCES CONTINUED	
2	FOR THE DEFENDANT	SANDRA GROSSMAN
3		
4	OFFICIAL COURT INTERPRETER:	RAMON DEL VILLAR, JR. (On standby)
5		(on bearaby)
6	PROBATION OFFICERS:	DEYANIRA LOREDO
7		CHRIS HOPKINS
8		
9	COURT REPORTER:	KATHY L. METZGER U.S. Courthouse
10		515 Rusk Room 8004
11	Houston, Texas 77002	
12		
13		
14		
15 16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 (Open court, interpreter on standby) THE COURT: All right. The Court calls Criminal Case 3 19-148, which I will note has now been unsealed pursuant to the 4 5 request. This is United States of America versus Gonzalo Morales. 6 7 Who's here for the government? MR. BRADYLYONS: Good morning, Your Honor. Drew 8 9 Bradylyons on behalf of the government. THE COURT: Bradylyons? 10 MR. BRADYLYONS: That's right, Your Honor. 11 12 THE COURT: Okay. Good. Good morning. MR. BRADYLYONS: Good morning. 13 14 THE COURT: All right. And for the defendant? 15 MR. MARTINEZ: Your Honor, good morning. May it 16 please the Court. 17 THE COURT: Yes, sir. Come up. MR. MARTINEZ: Your Honor, good morning. My name is 18 19 Bob Martinez. THE COURT: Mr. Martinez. 20 MR. MARTINEZ: I'm also here with attorney Stephen 21 Binhak and Andy Kaufman. 22 23 THE COURT: All right. MR. MARTINEZ: My client is right outside. We were 24 25 waiting for the conclusion of this proceeding.

THE COURT: All right. 1 2 MR. MARTINEZ: And I believe that Mr. Binhak, who will be addressing the Court, stepped out momentarily to go to the 3 restroom before coming back into the courtroom. 4 5 THE COURT: Okay. Very good. Thank you. MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Morales is here. Also counsel 6 7 Sandra Grossman. 8 THE COURT: Okay. Very good. Welcome to you all. Mr. Morales, come forward, please. 9 MR. MARTINEZ: And Mr. Morales speaks English, Your 10 Honor, but he would benefit from a translator. 11 12 THE COURT: Fine. No problem. MR. MARTINEZ: Mr. Binhak is in the restroom. 13 14 THE COURT: Okay. We'll wait for him. Y'all can sit 15 while we're waiting, that's fine. All right. Mr. Binhak? 16 17 MR. BINHAK: I'm sorry I'm late. I was in the bathroom. 18 THE COURT: No worries. We were running a little 19 overtime on the last one, so not a problem. 20 All right. Are we ready to go, Mr. Binhak? 21 22 MR. BINHAK: Yes, sir. THE COURT: All right. Mr. Morales, if you want to 23 24 stand up here or you can do it from the table, if you prefer, 25 it's fine.

```
MR. BINHAK: If it's okay with you, I'd prefer to
1
2
    stand up here.
             THE COURT: No, that's fine. Absolutely.
3
             MR. BINHAK: It's hard for me to hear, and we all have
4
5
    our masks on, so.
6
             THE COURT:
                         I understand.
                                        I understand.
7
                              So, Mr. Morales, is present. Do you
                  All right.
8
   have an interpreter who is interpreting for you, Mr. Morales?
9
             THE DEFENDANT:
                            I understand okay.
             THE COURT REPORTER: Can he use the microphone, Judge?
10
             THE COURT: Yes. There's a microphone right there.
11
   Go ahead.
12
             THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I understand, Judge.
13
             THE COURT: You understand English?
14
15
             THE DEFENDANT:
                             Yes.
             THE COURT: But we do have an interpreter standing by,
16
17
    if you need one. All right.
             THE INTERPRETER: That's correct, Your Honor.
18
19
             THE COURT: All right. So, Mr. Morales, this is a
    sentencing hearing in your case. I want to start by briefly
20
    describing the Court's sentencing procedures. The U.S. Supreme
21
    Court has held in the Booker case that the sentencing
22
    quidelines are advisory and not mandatory for judges. Booker
23
   requires the sentencing court to consider the guideline ranges,
24
25
   but it permits the court to tailor the sentence in light of
```

other statutory concerns as well.

The Court in the exercise of its sentencing discretion will rely on the factors which are set out in Section 3553(a) to fashion an appropriate sentence in your case to achieve the congressionally mandated purposes of sentencing as set forth in the Sentencing Reform Act of 1984. The Court will endeavor to faithfully apply the directives within the guidelines in their entirety to determine the total offense level and the criminal history category under the guidelines. Thereafter the Court will exercise its sentencing discretion to determine the appropriate sentence. In doing so, the Court will give considerable weight to the sentencing range calculated under the guidelines.

Any comments by the Court in the course of the sentencing are not to be construed as an indication that the Court believes that the guidelines are mandatory or that they constrain the Court's ultimate sentencing discretion.

The standard of proof for factual findings in connection with sentencing is preponderance of the evidence. And in determining whether that standard has been met, a presentence report is generally considered sufficiently reliable to be used by a trial court as evidence in making the factual determinations which are required by the advisory quidelines.

Now, in your case I have reviewed the presentence

report, which was prepared by the probation department. 1 2 No objections by the government? 3 MR. BRADYLYONS: That's correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. Let's see. I think you did --4 5 it wasn't filed as a formal objection, but as part of your sentencing memorandum, I think you filed an objection with 6 respect to the quideline calculations, Mr. Binhak? 7 8 MR. BINHAK: Yes, sir, we did. We did. 9 THE COURT: All right. MR. BINHAK: Judge, we don't believe that the PSI 10 reflects the agreed factual basis for the plea that's in 11 12 Mr. Morales' plea agreement. Specifically, the United States and Mr. Morales agreed that the total amount of bribes that 13 14 should be associated with him and attributed to him was 15 \$629,000 and that Mr. Morales received the benefit of at least 2.534 million dollars as a result of his conduct. And that's 16 17 in the plea agreement at 14. And those are the facts that came 18 through in the colloquy. 19 And I want to be a hundred percent clear, we are embracing that. We are not running away from that. What 20 Mr. Morales said at the plea colloquy and in his plea 21 agreement, he agrees with 100 percent. 22 23 By contrast, the PSI we believe uses a different 24 methodology and it looks to the conduct of the co-defendant 25 Mr. Gonzalez-Testino and more generally it says at Paragraph

27, "The total estimated benefit received from the bribery of PDVSA officials and contracts awarded to companies owned or partially owned by Gonzalez-Testino is 38.9 million dollars."

Now, Judge, in the Fifth Circuit, to hold a defendant accountable for conduct of others, the government must establish that the defendant agreed to jointly undertake criminal activities with a third person and that the particular activity was within the scope of the agreement. That's the United States versus, and I apologize for not pronouncing its name right, but Evbuomwan, which is at 9 -- it's E-v, like in Victor, b, like in boy, u-o-m, like in Mary, w-a-n, which is at 992 F.2d 70. It's a Fifth Circuit case from 1993. And that's citing 1.1 -- 1.B -- 1B1.3, and it essentially says what I just said, and it's in our brief.

Also, in *United States versus Rivera*, which is 898 F.2d 442, also a Fifth Circuit case from 1990, the defendant, Mr. Rivera, pled guilty to a distribution of heroin, and the court at -- the sentencing court at sentencing, the district court adopted the factual findings of the PSI and concluded that Mr. Rivera distributed all 224 grams of heroin that were described in the indictment. And the Fifth Circuit in that case reversed. And what it said is that the record showed that on this particular date Mr. Rivera admitted selling .28 grams of heroin and said that he should be essentially held to that standard.

We believe Mr. Gonzalo Morales' case presents a very similar situation. As I said, we absolutely and completely abide and adopt what he's pled guilty to and we think he should be held accountable for that. And if that's the case and you apply the guidelines, the benefit to him is 2.534 million dollars, which under the circumstances would mean that he should receive 12 months under 2X1.1, the conspiracy guideline, and 2C1.1, FCPA, because you cross-reference from the conspiracy to the FCPA, two points because the scheme involved more than one bribe, and then 16 additional points under 2B1.1(b)(2), because he received --

THE COURT: That's all right.

MR. BINHAK: That's fine. I just want to make sure you do everything you need to do. I recently did a trial with masks on and you just can't tell anything. All you see is eyebrows moving.

So anyway, the benefit would be greater than

1.5 million dollars and then, of course, followed by a

three-point reduction for acceptance of responsibility,

assuming that you grant the government's motion in that regard.

That would make the total 70 to 87 months, which is where --

THE COURT: You're still capped at 60 months.

MR. BINHAK: Yes, sir. So I don't want to make a distinction without a difference and running down a rabbit hole for no reason, but we do think it's important because I know

```
how seriously -- I actually just saw the questioning that you
1
2
   had just a moment ago, how seriously you take the parity
3
   between the cases and we think this is a very important
    indicator of where Mr. Morales sits in the grand scheme of
4
5
    things. So we don't think -- even though it will have no
    effect ultimately on the actual calculation of the quidelines,
6
    we think it's a very important proxy for where he stands in
7
8
    the -- among the other participants in the crime. So for that
    reason, I appreciate you listening to that and that's our
9
   position.
10
             THE COURT: All right. Is that the only objection you
11
12
   have?
             MR. BINHAK: Yes, sir.
13
14
             THE COURT: Okay. Fine.
                                       Thank you.
15
                  Mr. Bradylyons.
             MR. BRADYLYONS: It's the government's position, Your
16
   Honor, that the PSR correctly calculates the sentencing
17
                 That figure of approximately 38 million dollars
18
    quidelines.
19
    reflects the improper benefit that was reasonably foreseeable
    and jointly undertaken criminal activity between Mr. Morales
20
    and his principal co-conspirator Mr. Gonzalez.
21
22
                  The government would note that we agree with
    defense counsel that the personal benefit figure is important
23
24
    for the Court to consider in avoiding unwarranted sentencing
25
    disparities. And that figure here is about two and a half
```

million dollars. That being said, the number that the PSR identified of approximately 38 million dollars is the correct figure for loss amount purposes.

That number has not always been ascertainable in these cases. Where it has been in the cases of Mr. Hernandez, for example, and Mr. Millan, the Court did use that figure for purposes of the PSR. Those figures are astronomical. They're 102 million dollars and they are 145 million dollars. The personal benefit figures for those two defendants here, two and a half million dollars, were also relevant data points for the Court. But, Your Honor, it's the government's position that that 38 million dollars is correct.

THE COURT: All right. I've looked at this. Of course, I'm very familiar with this case and how these amounts are calculated. So I think the PSR calculated it correctly. So I'm going to overrule your objection on that, Mr. Binhak. But the figure that I really take into account more than just the gross loss amount figure is the personal benefit figure, and that kind of drives my desire to keep the defendants relatively -- the ones that are equally culpable, keep them in the same range. So even though I'm going to overrule your objection to it, the personal benefit figure I think is agreed at about two and a half million dollars.

MR. BINHAK: Yes, sir, slightly over. 2.543 is the number, and it's in our briefs and it's in the --

THE COURT: Right. 1 2 MR. BINHAK: And thank you for ruling on that, I appreciate it, and I'll address that later. I'm sure you'll 3 give me the opportunity to do that. 4 5 THE COURT: Of course I will. 6 MR. BINHAK: I know you will. 7 THE COURT: Of course I will. 8 Okay. So as a result of overruling the 9 objection, the Court will adopt the presentence report and find that the total offense level is 33 with a criminal history 10 category of I. That yields a recommended period of 11 12 imprisonment of 60 months pursuant to the five-year maximum for this particular offense; a period of supervised release of one 13 14 to three years; a fine range from 17,500 to \$77,852,000; and a 15 special assessment of \$100. All right. I note in this case the government 16 17 has filed a 5K motion asking me to give 25 percent off, to a sentence of 45 months; is that correct? 18 MR. BRADYLYONS: 19 That's correct, Your Honor. THE COURT: All right. What would you like to say 20 21 about that on behalf of the government? 22 MR. BRADYLYONS: Your Honor, from his first meeting with law enforcement, Mr. Morales was forthright, truthful, 23 24 honest, and provided fulsome information. He debriefed with 25 the government on multiple occasions. The information he

provided was corroborated, and it corroborated the information 1 2 provided by others. Mr. Morales was a notably eager cooperator. 3 Through counsel there were months where he would provide 4 5 information to law enforcement half a dozen times. enforcement was provided -- I'm sorry. That information was 6 provided to a multitude of law enforcement agencies. And in 7 8 light of that, Your Honor, the government requests that a departure of 25 percent to reflect that substantial assistance. 9 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 10 Mr. Binhak. 11 12 MR. BINHAK: I just want to make sure I go in the way you are accustomed to doing sentencings. Would you like me to 13 14 address all of my remarks at this time? 15 THE COURT: All your sentencing recommendations and remarks and then I will hear from the defendant. 16 17 MR. BINHAK: Yes, sir. And Mr. Morales does want to address the Court. 18 19 THE COURT: And I have read through your book. 20 MR. BINHAK: I know you have. I'm not going to repeat it. We gave you a lot of stuff and we just wanted to be super 21 22 thorough. 23 Judge, first, I want to thank you for having us 24 today and for granting extensions on behalf of Mr. Morales so 25 that he --

THE DEFENDANT: I need to sit down. 1 2 MR. BINHAK: Okay. He needs to sit down. 3 THE COURT: Fine, no problem. Please. 4 MR. BINHAK: And granting him the extensions for 5 COVID, so that we could all be here in person. It's very 6 important for Mr. Morales to address you personally, and we 7 appreciate that. 8 You know, Judge, throughout COVID, you know, I've been working through my home through a computer screen and I'm 9 been thinking a lot about the ritual of court and why it's 10 important and why we do things a certain way. You know, 11 12 there's a mundane reason why a big curtain goes up before a play or the conductor taps the baton or tells you things are 13 14 going to start or even why the judge comes in and we stand up. 15 But there's another reason --(Defendant stood back up) 16 17 THE COURT: Have a seat. It's fine, please. 18 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. 19 MR. BINHAK: But there's a much more important reason It tells you how serious the event is that we're 20 for that. 21 about to embark on. And as a defense attorney at a sentencing, it's my job to demonstrate to you that Mr. Morales takes it 22 that seriously. He doesn't take it as just a tap of the baton 23 24 and we move on, but he understands the gravity of the situation 25 that we're in and the gravity of what we're doing here.

And I think we will be able to demonstrate by telling a few things about his life and the way he's conducted himself in this case, that he has committed to not just the form of the ritual of the cooperation and the guilty plea and sentencing, but the true substance of that.

Mr. Morales pled guilty to one count of conspiracy to violate the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act in violation of 18 U.S.C. 371. He raised money for companies that procured equipment for PDVSA, and the companies used this money to procure equipment that they -- that PDVSA had ordered and then they would sell that -- that back to PDVSA at an inflated price and then they would use that inflated price to make improper payments and including paying back Mr. Gonzalez -- Mr. Morales and his investors where he raised the money from.

Mr. Morales violated United States law because he knew that these companies were paying bribes to officials at PDVSA and its procurement division Bariven in order to obtain the contracts in the first place to expedite payments and so that Bariven would award U.S. dollar-denominated contracts instead of Bariven, which was far more desirable for obvious reasons.

Now, Mr. Morales' history in Venezuela before he ever came to the United States is a very good example, we think, about how his character is to participate meaningfully and not just go through the motions of walking through the

ritual. Mr. Morales was born in Venezuela. His father was a mechanical engineer and a professor of engineering at various universities. At 98 years old his father remains a member of the prestigious academy that runs engineers.

His mother was a diplomat and she was Venezuela's ambassador to Peru. This gave him a very privileged start.

And Mr. Morales created a number of successful construction companies. He built single family homes, apartments, commercial buildings, and an airport. And as a result of that success, he could have continued to stay in the -- where he was and run his business and be a very successful man.

In 2006 he met a woman, Fabiola Colmenares, and at that time she was widely known. And in 2008 Ms. Colmenares founded the Popular Will party. And that party became a significant opposition party in the government.

And at this time Mr. Morales was also alarmed by the Chavez government, even though he could have continued to benefit from it and he supported the movement to maintain democracy in Venezuela. Through the activities of the VP, in 2009 Mr. Morales learned from Venezuela's former intelligence director, Miguel Rodriguez Torres, that Mr. Morales would have to leave the country immediately or be in extreme danger for his opposition work.

In short, long before he was ever involved in

this case, he left a comfortable and privileged life in his industry to challenge the government. And his conduct forced him to leave the country. He was not going through the motions. He was meaningfully participating.

We think the same is true, as an example, with his family life. Mr. Morales, after he came to the United States, married a woman. He adopted two children, age 6 and 8. But despite the divorce, he's still very close to his ex-wife. He's the father of the two young stepdaughters, and he provides for them financially.

And we've read the letter from his wife. And I'm sure you've also read the letter from the young woman -- the young girl, Isabella's therapist. Isabella is the developmentally challenged situation. And, you know, a lot of people when they're faced with a divorce or a special needs child, they withdraw. And Mr. Morales has not gone through the motions. He stepped in, and he's fully participated in a meaningful way. And as you can see from the letter from the therapist in particular, he is an extraordinarily important force in Isabella's life.

I think the media -- his media business also shows this situation where he's just not going through the motions. He is fully all in and part of the process.

In 2010 Mr. Morales founded *Venezuela al Dia*, which started as a printed newspaper in a western county near

Miami. And the paper became the largest circulation of Venezuela news.

Later he founded ElPolitico.com, which is a news website that focuses on Latin American news; also Descifrado.com, an economic news website; and the Miamidiario.com. He also founded VPITV, which is a broadcast station that was centered with Ms. Colmenares in Venezuela. And the whole purpose of this was -- of all these things was to be opposition to the government.

Now, my point here is that he could have gone out and made a *People* magazine. He could have made a lot of money selling celebrity news or sports or whatever, but he particularly focused on making change in his own country and he did it in a very serious way, so much so that the government shut down the VPITV and has shut down access to his outlets in Venezuela.

He has provided through these networks critical support to Mr. Guaidó, who has written a letter on his behalf, and the VP, the political party that he was around for the founding of. And he has helped to expose Maduro government's human rights abuses and criminal behavior. All three founders of the VP wrote to the Court, and you have those letters.

Then you saw the letter from Jorge Antonio

Betancourt Silva, which is a critical letter and shows in great

detail and we went through it in great detail in our

submission, about how critical this media presence is in Venezuela and how his -- how Mr. Morales' journalists and news operations have exposed corruption, crime, and lack of democracy in Venezuela, also, how Mr. Morales has helped with the logistics to support very important humanitarian aid and political efforts in the country.

And Mr. Silva further describes the unique political, sensitive political intelligence information that Mr. Morales has been able to expose and specific illegal activity which is in the Maduro regime. And that's in our -- I won't read it again.

But I think what is the most important achievement that Mr. Morales has had through this effort -through these efforts, and we've identified one with the letter from Gilber Alexander Caro Alfonzo, the Venezuelan state of Miranda representative who was smuggled -- or Mr. Morales helped to smuggle out of Venezuela to avoid torture is probably the best example of him not just going through the ritual but in putting himself out at personal risk and personal harm to save other people who would have a very horrible fate otherwise. And Mr. Caro Alfonzo is not the only one. He's just the one that we chose to show you. There are several more.

So the point here that I'm trying to make, Judge, is that what you're going to hear when you speak to

Mr. Morales, and I encourage you to ask any questions that you have of him, is a man of substance, who is not going through the motions. He is not the kind of person who's just going to get up and say what you need to hear here and just open the curtains so the show could start. This is a serious man who feels deeply shameful for what he's done.

And that brings us to his immigration status and a particularly shameful part of -- particularly for him a source of great shame. What Mr. Morales will tell you is that when he left Venezuela because he had to, he came to this country. And this country was a refuge for him to be safe, so that he could prefer democracy. And it is a sense of great shame for him that he violated the laws while he was here, and he considers that a particularly embarrassing part of this situation.

And if he were to go home, he -- the last time he went home, he was followed by the police. He believes he would be tortured. And as a result of his asylum application and the things that he's done right in the United States, notwithstanding this colossal -- his crime is really the only way to say it, he has been a productive member of the U.S. and particularly the Venezuelan/U.S. community so much so that just at the end of October, in the last 15 days or so, the Department of Homeland Security gave him a deferred action letter, which is a relatively rare thing to get. And it says,

"You have been granted deferred action as an act of discretion by and for the administrative convenience of the United States government." And that's partially because, I think, of his cooperation and the cooperation that may happened before, but no matter how much you cooperate, if you're a bad guy, you're not going to get that.

And there's also a work permit coming there.

And, of course, this does not bind you at all, no question at all. But I think it shows an indication of at least what one part of the United States government thinks about whether

Mr. Morales can be a productive contributing member of our society. And, so, I think that's an important thing.

Then we can move on to the cooperation that Mr. Morales gave. As the United States has just told you, Mr. Morales cooperated from the beginning. He did something that most defense lawyers would really pull their hair out if they saw, which is he went in without immunity and his lawyers on the very first meeting and he disclosed what he was doing and who he was doing it with. In my experience, Judge, as both a prosecutor and a defense attorney, I've been doing this for 30 years, I hope I don't look like that old, but you rarely see that. I've rarely seen that in my experience.

Then after fully disclosing what he did, I think is where he went on to do some exceptional things for the United States. Through his network of contacts and media

outlets and relationships in Venezuela, sometimes at the request of the investigators but sometimes on his own initiative, Mr. Morales provided more than a hundred very sensitive documents, including passports, Venezuela immigration records, flight plans, and airplane tail numbers, internal PDVSA documents and other Venezuelan documents, which gave the United States in many -- I won't say many, in several key instances its first glimpse of what was going on in real time in Venezuela.

Now, I know that you see people come and cooperate on a regular basis and it's -- you know, a very distinguished judge in our district, who's now on the Eleventh Circuit, Judge Marcus, used to say, There's proactive, going out and putting yourself in harm, putting on a wire, having conversations, testifying at trial, these are the highest levels of cooperation, as opposed to just sitting in a room and just telling some people what you did. Well, this I would submit to you, because he did not have the chance to testify, that's not his situation, he was not in a position to make recordings, this is that kind of cooperation. This is putting yourself out and getting the kind of cooperation that most people never are able to give to the United States.

And we give tremendous credit to people who testify, but this is, I think, at another level. Let me give you just -- let me highlight a couple of specific examples from

our papers.

In September of 2019 Mr. Morales smuggled, with other people's help, out of Venezuela a 19-page letter which is handwritten by the former Minister of Oil and President of PDVSA. And this letter outlined areas of Venezuelan government corruption, including the details of Alex Saab's role as a money launderer for President Maduro. And Mr. Saab has recently made his way back to Miami, Florida, where he will answer in part for those very allegations, I believe, as a casual but informed observer.

In February 17 -- on February 17th of 2021, Mr. Morales provided to the United States a report outlining the Venezuelan anti-aircraft missile defense program. Among other things, this report included a description of the Russian IGLA-S system that's installed in Venezuela with detailed maps identifying how the system and the missiles are deployed. That's an extraordinary thing. I'm sure the government had great use for it and not just at the Department of Justice but in other places.

In March of 2021, Mr. Morales provided to the United States information regarding meetings between Venezuelan government officials and suspected Ukrainian money launderers, including the flight plans, the passenger names, and tail numbers associated with their travel to Venezuela.

And I believe just based on the conversations

that I've had indirectly with the agents, that in 2019, I believe it was, that Mr. Morales was the first person to tell the United States how Venezuela was smuggling gold out of the country and literally had pictures of boxes of gold bars on private aircraft leaving the country. He was able to obtain those and the tail numbers and who were bringing the planes and when they were leaving, and we handed those over to the United States. And that was a major effort by Venezuela that was beginning to avoid the OPEC sanctions that were -- that had just recently begun to really strengthen in at that time.

We believe this exceptional cooperation extends far beyond the normal cooperation that you see, as I said, and I think also it's just another example of how you're seeing a man who's serious and is not just making stuff up to please you now. This is a lifetime of doing good things and in the midst of a horrible and tragic fundamental error of judgment that caused him to commit a crime. And that was just wrong, and I think he'll tell you that.

And I think, as this woman who was just being sentenced, and I don't know her name, said, that this does not define me, this one act. Well, I think it's fair to say that the crime that Mr. Morales committed doesn't define the entire person. It's part of the person. It's a flaw that he engaged in, but there are many other pieces that are worthy of recognition.

So the other thing I would like to touch on at this point, Judge, is Mr. Morales' health. In late February of 2021, he was literally picked up at his hospital -- at his home and brought to the hospital and was -- well, to be blunt, his brother called me and said that he was about to die. That's what I heard about him. His recovery is really, according to the doctor, it's -- I hope you had a chance to read the -- excuse me, to look at the video and I can see by your nodding that you did, and to read the letter, it was really just essentially a miracle that he is sitting here today. And for that Mr. Morales is fundamentally and extraordinarily grateful.

You know, Judge, I am not in the habit and I would not come in front of you and say someone shouldn't go to jail because they're going to die. I'm not saying that. And I'm also not saying that Mr. Morales should get a pass because he's been ill. But I think he should an accommodation, and that's what we're really asking for. And I'll get back to that in just one second.

So, I'd just like to touch now just briefly on the actual crime so we just put this all in context of this horrible decision that he made, which really has derailed his life in a fundamental way. As I said, starting in 2012

Mr. Morales began working with his friend Jose Manuel Gonzalez Testino, a name that I know that you know, and he was investing in Mr. Gonzalez's companies, which were bidding for contracts

with PDVSA. And when Gonzalez would win a bid, Morales would identify and secure capital and some of them, but not all, but some in order to procure the supplies that PDVSA ultimately were selling.

Now, let there be no doubt, this is why we're here. Mr. Morales knew that Mr. Gonzalez was paying -providing bribes and paying bribes to PDVSA officials,
including Cesar David Rincon-Godoy, another name that I know
that you know, who was the general manager of PDVSA's
procurement office called Bariven. Mr. Gonzalez, as I said
earlier, paid these bribes so that Mr. Rincon would direct
contracts to Mr. Gonzalez's companies. He would give these
contracts priority for payment and that they would also get
dollar-based contracts far more valuable than bolivars.

For the investments that Mr. Morales made, there were \$629,000 worth of bribes that were involved. And I am not trying to revisit your ruling before. I'm just trying to give you the context of his role.

Mr. Gonzalez also paid bribes -- agreed to pay bribes to an entity called "The Group," which I'm sure is a phrase that you've heard before. These were the individuals who controlled Bariven. And, again, let there be no doubt, Mr. Morales knew about these bribe payments because he met in 2012 with Mr. Luis Carlos de Leon, who was a member of The Group. So, he knew it was going on.

During the meeting Mr. de Leon told Mr. Morales that the Morales/Gonzalez companies would have to pay The Group a 10 percent fee, surcharge, bribe, gratuity, whatever word you want to use, but there's the crime, the value of the contracts that PDVSA awarded going forward. And after Mr. Morales told Mr. Gonzalez about that 10 percent payment, Mr. Gonzalez confirmed to Mr. Morales that these payments would be made. So, as I said, we are not in any way walking away from responsibility for the conduct here.

And along these lines, at a meeting with Alejandro Isturiz Chiesa, Mr. Isturiz provided payment instructions to Mr. Morales and Mr. Morales relayed those payment instructions to Mr. Gonzalez. And Mr. Gonzalez confirmed that he was making the payments.

That relationship between Mr. Gonzalez and Mr. Morales lasted for approximately two to three years. And Mr. Morales received, I can give you the exact number, \$2,524,365.65 to his bank. That's his personal benefit that arrives from this, which is a significant number, and I'll get to that with respect to the others in just a second.

Judge, we believe that you should downward depart on the facts that I've just laid out to you. First, I understand it's an Eleventh Circuit case, but in *United States v. Rodriguez*, when a person doesn't get any credit for the three points and it just sort of evaporates, the judge has

authority to incorporate that into a downward departure and take account of that.

We're asking that you make that part of your consideration to reduce the sentence. There's no question in my mind that Mr. Morales made immediate acceptance of responsibility, and I think that should be covered in his sentence.

The second thing we would like you to consider is the placement in the scheme. Mr. Morales was a financier. And I'm not minimizing here. That's important. You know, things don't get done without dollars to finance. But he was not an architect of the broader scheme. He didn't arrange the specific relationships that caused the bribes. He did not carry money around in bags to give the bribes.

We think, Judge, that if you were to sentence him in the heartland of the people that you've sentenced, he would be similar to the Millan case, where there was an FCPA violation, also, 18 U.S.C. 371, with a personal benefit of \$533,000 and change. Millan got three years of probation.

And similar, the Beech case, which is also a 371 FCPA conspiracy, where Beech received an \$833,000 personal benefit.

We think Millan -- well, you will recall, Judge, that Millan received three years probation, but 500,000 is substantially less than 2.5 million. And Beech received 12

months and a day for imprisonment, \$833,000 worth of personal benefit, which is about 40 percent of where Mr. Morales is.

We believe, Judge, that without the health issue, that Mr. Morales would rightly fall into a prison sentence of one -- of 12 months and 1 day. And we think that would fit in line. And the reason, even though Mr. Morales is greater personal benefit than Mr. Beech, we believe that -- and although they are both getting the same reduction request for cooperation, we believe that Mr. Morales' cooperation is extraordinary and we believe he should get a slightly -- well, a more significant reduction than the government is asking the Court for.

I've cited you the Sentencing Commission's general rules and the statistics on what happens for people who've cooperated, and it's almost 70 percent is the average across the United States. So I don't think this is out of line with what's going on across the United States for cooperators in bribery cases, but I certainly I understand that you want to keep the parity within this case. So, and that average reduction is 77 -- 76.7 percent. Also, the acceptance of responsibility.

So, where we're asking for the accommodation, I said to you before, the accommodation, we believe that instead of a custodial sentence for that 12 years and -- excuse me, 12 months and 1 day, goodness gracious, that's a mistake, right,

12 months and 1 day, which would probably allow Mr. Morales to leave custody sometime in the eleventh month with credit, tenth or eleventh month. We think that in order to allow him to continue to have the therapy that he needs, the nutrition that he needs and if something horrible happens, to have access to a hospital, that you place him under home detention for a period of anywhere from 10 to 12 months. You may decide that it's not enough -- that he shouldn't get credit because he's going to be home as opposed to somewhere else. So, you know, my recommendation is 11 months, because that's what I think he would get back if he would be in jail, but I'm not going to sit here and quibble over the month. So, home detention.

Also -- and that is not -- I think what the message that sends is I'm giving the same sentence that I would ordinarily give to this person, but I'm giving an accommodation to accommodate his health. But what's important also, and this is not in our brief and I apologize for not putting it in, it's my error, is that rather than -- we don't want anybody to think that Mr. Morales is sitting at home watching TV. We want to turn this into something productive. And I don't think it's enough for him to sit home and work on his businesses even if it will help democracy in Venezuela, which is very important, but that's just businesses he owns and that can make him money. I want you to be sure that there's (A) a productive use of his time for the community and at large and (2) a message that

nobody got anything off free.

And I think for every week that he's home -- or every month, he should have, whether you do it 30 hours a week or 120 hours a month, however you show, he should have community service. And I think that community service should be hands-on specific work with underprivileged people. Because Mr. Morales grew up in such a privileged side, I think the best way for him to give back is to people who really didn't have the advantages he did.

We have a specific suggestion. There's an organization in Miami called the Camillus House. It feeds homeless and houses homeless people and provides medical care to 12,500 people in an average year. 50,000 meals a month or something like that. We think that either that, Camillus House, or some place like it on a -- basically on a full-time basis. That would be the only reason he would be able to go out of the house other than doctors, lawyers, and church. It would be a way to accommodate without in any way undermining the seriousness of what's happened in this case.

So, Judge, I want to end with where I began, and thank you so much for being so generous with your time. I've been a little longer, but my wife says that that's a genetic problem for me.

THE COURT: It happens in our profession.

MR. BINHAK: But I want to end where I started. I

want to introduce you, when you're ready, if you want to hear from the government first, but I want to introduce you to Mr. Morales. I want you to feel free to ask him any question you want. He has some things that he would like to say to you.

And I just want to -- I hope that I have -- I

And I just want to -- I hope that I have -- I hope that I've discharged my responsibility in demonstrating to you that this is not a man who's just waiting for the curtain to go up so he can do something. I hope that I've set the stage, pardon the pun, for him to show you and demonstrate with his own words and with his own heart that he's extraordinarily remorseful for, really no other way to say it, but a stupid, stupid, greedy act, and that he has tried since the moment that he could to make it right and he would like to continue to make it right going forward. So if you have any questions, I'm happen to answer them; otherwise, I'll just -- I'll shut up.

THE COURT: All right. I think I understand completely your recommendation with respect to sentencing. Before I hear from Mr. Morales, I'm going to give Mr. Bradylyons an opportunity to say anything that he would like to say to sum up on behalf of the government based on what we've heard from the defense.

MR. BRADYLYONS: Yes, Your Honor. Just briefly and without going back into what's in our sentencing memorandum, we do believe that this was a significant bribery scheme and that Mr. Morales played a significant role in it. He was not merely

a bystander. He had conversations with members of the management team at PDVSA and Bariven. In light of that, the government recommends a custodial sentence.

I think the four most relevant sentences for the Court to consider when fashioning a sentence for Mr. Morales are those sentences of Mr. Beech, Mr. Padron, and Misters Muller and Pinto. Mr. Morales is slightly differently situated than each of those. So, Mr. Padron received a sentence of 18 months. His personal benefit was considerably greater than Mr. Morales', but the government requested a smaller 5K.

Mr. Muller and Mr. Pinto received sentences of 20 and 24 months respectively. Their personal benefits were smaller than Mr. Morales', but those defendants both pled guilty to two counts and received 5Ks that were less than the 5K that the government is asking for Mr. Morales.

And, finally, Mr. Beech received less money than Mr. Morales did, less than half, and received a 5K of approximately a similar amount. I think the sentences of Mr. Padron and Mr. Beech are the two most relevant sentences for the Court to consider when fashioning the sentence for Mr. Morales.

THE COURT: Let me ask you, with respect to the medical condition and the report of the doctor, do you think that any kind of accommodation is either required or should be considered in light of his medical condition and his episode,

cardiac arrest? 1 2 MR. BRADYLYONS: We certainly think it would be appropriate to consider it. We don't believe it's required, 3 Your Honor. I think we have confidence that B.O.P. can handle 4 5 a great number of medical conditions. So, it's certainly something to consider, but nevertheless, the government 6 requests a custodial sentence for Mr. Morales. 7 8 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. All right. I would like to hear from 9 Mr. Morales, please. 10 11 THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor --12 THE COURT: Yes, sir. THE DEFENDANT: -- how are you? 13 14 THE COURT: Fine. Thank you. How are you? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Well, I am here standing in front of First of all, thanks to an opportunity that God gave me, 16 17 bringing me back from death. So I owe a big debt to God and to all the people that surrounded me. That I'm really ashamed to 18 19 have failed your country, my family, the people who trusted me, which generally a lot of people trust me. 20 And not one word that is coming from my mouth 21 today, I may not say a lie. I wanted to say that I'm really, 22 23 really sorry, that the country that allowed me to come, embrace 24 me and makes me live a different life than I was living. Being

Venezuelan is not easy. Being Venezuelan is like, not a bad

25

citizenship, where anything can happen from one day to another. We suffer a lot of changes. Families, they separate. My sister lives in Germany. My brother lives in North Carolina. My other sister lives in Paris. My father is retired and then from son to son, maybe visit one. And I have my -- glad to have my father here. He's 97 years old.

And they just told me since I was a kid to respect the laws and respect people above all. I don't have anything else that comes into my mind different, that greed took a moment of weakness from me and, well, I'm really, really sorry. Because since that moment my life has become a disaster, sir, in many ways, not only the health and my personal life, it's been to tough. I'm working on amend things, trying to be better and not repeat any of this ever again. All I can say is I'm sorry. I have the most respect for the prosecutors' table, I have for my lawyers, for you, Your Honor. And, well, saying that, I'm sorry.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Morales. Thank you very much.

All right. I think what I'm going to do in this case, I think probably Mr. Beech is the most comparable in terms of culpability in terms of the defendant in this case, and so I think I would ordinarily impose a sentence of 12 months and a day, after granting the government's 5K motion and going down farther than they suggested. I would ordinarily

impose a sentence of 12 months and a day, but I think in this 1 case I'm going to do a split sentence. 2 I'm going to do six months in the custody of the 3 Bureau of Prisons and then I'm going to do six months of home 4 5 confinement. And I do like your idea with respect to the 6 7 community service. So during the six months of home 8 confinement, the defendant will be required to perform community service of 120 hours for each of those six months. 9 And I do believe Camillus House is recommended, would probably 10 be -- I'm going to recommend that that community service be 11 12 serviced -- I'm going to order it to be served there. MR. BINHAK: Understood. And we'll reach out to make 13 14 the arrangements for him to be a volunteer there, so that 15 immediately when he comes out there will be no -- there will just be no break. 16 17 THE COURT: All right. MR. BINHAK: May I just make one --18 19 THE COURT: Yes. MR. BINHAK: -- I don't mean to interrupt you, Judge. 20 21 THE COURT: No, go ahead. MR. BINHAK: There's a conceivable issue with 22 immigration law and I just want to build this into what we're 23 24 doing here. I'm not trying to reargue your ruling. I just 25 want to -- I'm not an immigration lawyer. We do have his

immigration lawyer here, Mr. Morales' immigration lawyer. With this deferred action, it's quite possible that when he goes in, wherever he goes, there will be -- at the B.O.P., there will be a detainer on him and he will have to spend some period of time, maybe an indefinite period of time in immigration hold. And I just want you to understand that so you can -- I don't want him to violate anything by being in the wrong place at the right time. So, again, I'm not trying to change your mind on what you've done. I respect your ruling. I just want to make you aware of that issue so that he doesn't -- he's not somewhere that he can't be at Camillus House because he is -- because the Department of Homeland Security.

Now, I'm hopeful that the fact that they gave him deferred action and a work -- and they're giving him a work permit, I'm hopeful that the immigration side of the house will be able to work this out and we won't interfere with the sentence that you're going to impose on the J&C. And, again, I'm not trying to retread anything here. I just want to make you aware of that issue, so we don't have a problem.

THE COURT: Okay. I think that -- I would imagine the probation officer who's supervising him on his home confinement can probably take care of that issue; and if there are any problems, they would let me know.

PROBATION OFFICER LOREDO: Right. And I'm assuming he will be supervised in Florida where he resides.

THE COURT: I'm assuming that as well.

PROBATION OFFICER LOREDO: We will have to get with their office to see -- we have in Houston obviously approved agencies. I don't know if this is one of them. So what we would like to note in the judgment is that he would be doing community service at Camillus House, if approved by the probation office there.

THE COURT: That is correct, yeah. And if there's a problem with that, then let me know and we can come up with some other agency.

PROBATION OFFICER LOREDO: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Thank you.

All right. So while on home confinement, the defendant shall not commit another federal, state, or local crime; shall comply with the standard conditions that have been adopted by this Court; abide by any mandatory conditions required by law; and shall comply with the following additional conditions -- let's see. Wait a minute. Here we go.

All right. You must provide the probation officer with access to any requested financial information and authorize the release of any financial information. The Probation Office may share that financial information with the U.S. Attorney's Office.

You must not incur any credit card charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the

probation officer.

You must immediately report, continue to report, or surrender to U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement and follow all of their instructions and reporting requirements in the event that any duplication proceedings are commenced.

You are also -- if you are ordered deported from the United States, then you must remain outside the United States unless legally authorized to reenter. If you reenter the United States, you must report to the nearest probation office within 72 hours after you return.

You must seek proper documentation from U.S.

Immigration and Customs Enforcement authorizing you to work in the United States.

The Court finds that the defendant does, in fact, have the ability to pay a fine in this case. Therefore, the Court will impose a fine in the amount of \$100,000.

It is further ordered that the defendant shall pay to the United States a special assessment of \$100 due immediately through the United States District Clerk, Southern District of Texas.

Having assessed the defendant's ability to pay, payment of the total criminal monetary penalty shall be due as follows: The defendant shall begin payment immediately. Any unpaid balance due will be due in payments of the greater of \$25 per quarter or 50 percent of any wages earned while in

```
The defendant shall receive credit for any payments
1
2
   made through the Bureau of Prisons Inmate Financial
3
   Responsibility Program. Any balance remaining after release
    from imprisonment shall be paid in monthly installments of
4
5
    $1,000 to commence 30 days after release to home confinement.
    Payments are to be made through the United States District
6
    Clerk, Southern District of Texas.
7
8
                  I am going to also impose a period of supervised
    release after the home confinement of three years. And I'm
9
    going to waive the urinalysis testing and the mandatory
10
    conditions.
11
                  Let's see. Do we have an order of forfeiture in
12
    this case?
13
14
             MR. BRADYLYONS: We do, Your Honor. There's a money
15
    judgment has been entered in the amount of $2,534,365.65.
16
             THE COURT: Okay. So that's taken care of?
17
             MR. BRADYLYONS: Yes, Your Honor.
18
             THE COURT: All right.
19
             PROBATION OFFICER LOREDO: Your Honor --
20
             THE COURT: Yes.
             PROBATION OFFICER LOREDO: -- during the period of
21
    home confinement, would you like any type of location
22
   monitoring to be determined by the probation officer to make
23
24
    sure he is home?
25
             THE COURT: Yes, I would. That's a good idea.
                                                              Thank
```

```
you. Thank you.
1
2
             PROBATION OFFICER HOPKINS: Your Honor, just to
    clarify --
3
             THE COURT: Yeah.
4
5
             PROBATION OFFICER HOPKINS: -- the home detention will
   be served while on supervised release? There won't be six
6
    months of home detention, then three years of SRT?
 7
8
             THE COURT: The first six months of the supervised
    release term will be home confinement.
9
             PROBATION OFFICER HOPKINS: Correct.
10
11
             THE COURT: Yes. Thank you.
12
                  All right. Any other clarifications necessary?
    Good.
           Thank you. I appreciate you doing that.
13
14
             MR. BRADYLYONS: Not from the government, Your Honor.
15
             THE COURT: All right. Anything else? No, we don't
   need to dismiss any counts or anything?
16
17
             MR. BRADYLYONS: That's correct, Your Honor.
             THE COURT: Okay. Very good.
18
19
                  Anything else?
             MR. BINHAK: Judge, I have a request, if you don't
20
   mind.
21
22
             THE COURT: Yes.
             MR. BINHAK: At least in my neck of the woods, it's
23
24
    appropriate to ask the Court to make a recommendation on a --
25
             THE COURT: Placement?
```

```
MR. BINHAK: -- place.
1
2
             THE COURT:
                         Sure.
             MR. BINHAK: And I absolutely understand and
3
   Mr. Morales understands that it's not binding on the B.O.P.
4
5
   But there's a -- in South Miami and I will get the name and I
    will notify your chambers in the next hour.
6
7
             THE COURT: We can put in the judgment as close to
    South Miami as possible to the B.O.P.
8
             MR. BINHAK: Yes, because this way he will be close to
9
                  There's a camp in -- about 25 miles from his
10
   his doctors.
   home, south, which will keep him close enough and maybe we
11
12
    could even get a situation where his doctor could visit him and
    do something like that. So, I would appreciate that. And I
13
14
    also I just noticed from the lack of anybody in the room, that
15
    I would ask for voluntary surrender but --
16
             THE COURT: Oh, yes, of course. You're not opposed to
17
    it?
             MR. BRADYLYONS: No objection, Your Honor.
18
19
             THE COURT: Okay. Has he signed the document, Ruth?
20
             MR. BINHAK:
                          No, we haven't.
21
             THE COURT: Okay. So there's the document to be
    signed --
22
23
             MR. BINHAK: Okay.
24
             THE COURT: -- before you leave.
             MR. BINHAK: And, Judge, just with regard to what I'd
25
```

```
ask, is a voluntary surrender just sometime after January 5th,
1
2
    6th, so he can do the holidays with his family and then he
    can -- if he could start --
3
             THE COURT: If you get a reporting date prior to that,
4
5
    just ask me and I'll -- you don't have any objection to that, I
6
    assume?
7
             MR. BRADYLYONS: No objection at all.
8
             MR. BINHAK: Thank you, Judge. We really appreciate
         Thank you for your time.
9
    it.
             THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
10
11
                  Mr. Morales, good luck to you.
             THE DEFENDANT: Thank you very much, Your Honor.
12
                            Thank you, Your Honor.
13
             MR. MARTINEZ:
             THE COURT: All right. Thank you.
14
15
        (Concluded at 12:14 p.m.)
16
    I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the
17
    record of proceedings in the above-entitled cause, to the best
18
    of my ability.
19
20
21
22
    Court Reporter
23
24
25
```